

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,010	06/03/2005	Shinichi Ookubo	040894-7251	6869
9629 7	590 03/20/2006		EXAM	INER
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			TIBBITS, PIA FLORENCE	
WASHINGTO		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		2838	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			HA
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
	10/538,010	OOKUBO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Pia F. Tibbits	2838	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	ICATION.  The reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status -			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•		
	action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	·	•	
Disposition of Claims			
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>			
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) $\square$ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 June 2005</u> is/are: a)		•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		i).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in a rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/3/05.	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/538,010 Page 2

Art Unit: 2838

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Priority**

1. This application is a national stage entry of PCT/JP03/14585

# **Drawings**

- 2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the external recharger must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the conventional names, as described in the specification, e.g. capacitor, grip part, contact arm, etc. for the elements shown in figures with non-conventional symbols. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

Art Unit: 2838

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

# Specification

4. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kubale et al.** [6525511] in view of disclosed Prior Art, **JP-09285006.**

Kubale discloses a cordless power tool 18 powered by a power supply 14, a motor 54 [see fig.1A], and an external recharger 22 [see fig.2B]. Kubale does not disclose the power supply including an electric double layer capacitor.

JP discloses in the abstract a power supply comprising capacitors C1-C5 and a charging electrode/cathode to supply large electric power to a load while minimizing a burden and bad effect on a storage battery and a motor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kubale's apparatus and include the power supply, as disclosed by JP, in order to supply large electric power to a load while minimizing a burden and bad effect on a storage battery and a motor.

As to the use of an electric double layer capacitor, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of "optimum" or "preferred" material that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made using routine experimentation would have found obvious to provide for the capacitor disclosed by Kubale and JP in order to accommodate application specifics since it has been held to be a matter of obvious design choice and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use of the invention. See *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955), In re Boesch, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claim 2, Kubale and JP disclose a secondary battery BAT disposed in parallel to the electric double layer capacitor C1-C5, when a start switch SW1 is off, the electric double layer capacitor C1-C5 is charged by the secondary battery BAT or the external recharger 22, and when the start switch SW1 is on, current is supplied from the electric double layer capacitor to the motor 54.

As to claims 4, 5, see remarks and references above.

7. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubale, as described above, in view of disclosed Wang et al. [6373152].

Kubale does not disclose the power supply including an electric double layer capacitor.

Wang discloses a power supply for a tool [see abstract; column 1, line 11] comprising capacitor 4 and a charging electrode/cathode to meet the requirement of a large and instantaneous current output [see column 1, lines 43-44]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kubale's apparatus and include the power supply, as disclosed by Wang, in order to meet the requirement of a large and instantaneous current output.

As to the use of an electric double layer capacitor, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of "optimum" or "preferred" material that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the Art Unit: 2838

invention was made using routine experimentation would have found obvious to provide for the capacitor disclosed by Kubale and Wang in order to accommodate application specifics since it has been held to be a matter of obvious design choice and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use of the invention. See *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955), *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claim 2, Kubale and Wang disclose a secondary battery 2 disposed in parallel to the electric double layer capacitor 4, when a start switch 11 is off, the electric double layer capacitor 4 is charged by the secondary battery 2 or the external recharger 22, and when the start switch 11 is on, current is supplied from the electric double layer capacitor to the motor via terminal 3.

As to claim 3, Kubale does not disclose the secondary battery is a lithium-ion battery.

Wang discloses the secondary battery is a lithium-ion battery, which is preferable since it is light, has a high capacity, can be repeatedly used for an extended period of time, and does not have memory effect [see column 2, lines 43-49]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kubale's apparatus and include a lithium-ion battery as the secondary battery of the power supply, as disclosed by Wang, in order to a lighter power supply that has a high capacity, can be repeatedly used for an extended period of time, and does not have memory effect.

As to claims 4-6, see remarks and references above.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/538,010 Page 6

Art Unit: 2838

#### Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art cited in PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related apparatus.

- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Pia Tibbits whose telephone number is 571-272-2086. If unavailable, contact the Supervisory Patent Examiner Karl Easthom whose telephone number is 571-272-1989. The Technology Center Fax number is 571-273-8300.
- Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**PFT** 

March 13, 2006

Pia Tibbits

Primary Patent Examinèr